



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a whole to the general reader or the young student. For such a reader Hogarth's Philip and Butcher's little book are still the best introduction to the life of Demosthenes. This book is for the mature and serious student, and for him it will be of very great value.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

CHARLES D. ADAMS.

The Origin of Attic Comedy. By F. M. Cornford. London: Edward Arnold; New York: Longmans, Green, and Co. (1914). Pp. xii + 252. \$2.40 net.

The present reviewer is free to confess that he took up this book with a distinct prejudice. Mr. Cornford belongs to a group of English classicists the brilliance of whose scholarship is second only to their intrepidity. Much as Mr. Gilbert Murray, Miss Jane Harrison, Professor William Ridgeway, and the rest may differ in other respects, they agree in seeking light upon classical problems from anthropological lore and in sticking at no exegesis which will contribute to this happy consummation. Then, when I read in the first paragraph of Mr. Cornford's Preface that "the constant features of the Aristophanic play were inherited from a ritual drama" and recalled how disingenuously the same author, in his Thucydides Mythistoricus, had resolved the three appearances of Cleon on that historian's pages into "the complete outline of a drama", my misgivings did not lessen. If I add that with further reading my prejudice against Mr. Cornford's volume has vanished, I must not be understood as accepting to any great extent his conclusions. But with the exception of his statement that "it is tempting to see in the two half-choruses of twelve in Attic Comedy, the twelve months of the Old and the New Years" (p. 129, n. 2), Mr. Cornford rides his anthropological hobbyhorse with comparative discretion. In fact this is the only utterly preposterous suggestion that I have noted. Of still greater consequence than the sober application of his viewpoint, however, is the fact that there is a certain factor which differentiates the origin of comedy from most other studies in origins.

This factor is brought out in Aristotle's statement that "comedy originated with the leaders of the phallic ceremonies, *which still survive as institutions in many of our cities*". Mr. Cornford finds the best illustration of these ceremonies in Aristophanes, Acharn. 241 ff., and concludes from this and other evidence that the phallic rites had a double object—that they were both a "positive agent of fertilization" and a "negative charm against evil spirits". The former result was obtained by the invocation of friendly powers: as to the latter,

the simplest of all methods of expelling such malign influences of any kind is to abuse them with the most violent language. No distinction is drawn between this and the custom of abusing, and even beating, the persons or things which are to be rid of them . . . There can be no doubt that the element of invective and personal satire which distinguishes the Old Comedy is directly descended from the magical abuse of the

phallic procession, just as its obscenity is due to the sexual magic; and it is likely that this ritual justification was well known to an audience familiar with the phallic ceremony itself.

I believe these quotations to represent sound conclusions. Now, if the phallic ceremonies continued until Aristotle's day and if their connection with comedy had always been recognized, the hypothesis that comedy always harked back to this primitive ritual is not so fantastic as it would otherwise be. In my opinion, our author is correct also in tracing the agon and the parabasis of Old Comedy, as well as its physical violence and horseplay, back to the magical aversion of evil in the phallic rites. I regret to state that, with minor exceptions, this marks the limit of the concessions I can make to Mr. Cornford's views.

Writers on the origin of Attic comedy are fairly well agreed upon one point, that only some features of it are indigenous and that it has been greatly modified by importations from Sicily and the Peloponnesus. But, when they undertake to separate the foreign and the native elements, concord flies out of the window. Yet even this single point of unanimity is unacceptable to Mr. Cornford, who maintains that every part of Old Comedy is Attic and would reduce the Dorian influence to a minimum. He acknowledges adherence to Professor Murray's theory concerning the origin of tragedy and constructs a very similar hypothesis, *mutatis mutandis*, for comedy. Comedy, then, was derived from sympathetic magic, from "the fertility drama of the marriage of the Old Year transformed into the New". Every year a stereotyped series of incidents was repeated. The ritual began with an agon between the good principle and the bad principle (the New Year versus the Old, Summer versus Winter, Life versus Death, etc.), was continued either by the defeat and death of the latter, followed by a sacrifice and feast of thanksgiving; or by the death of the former, who was slain, dismembered, cooked, and eaten in the communal feast, only to be triumphantly resurrected. In either case, the festivities are interrupted by a succession of "unwelcome intruders" consisting of stock characters like the buffoon, the doctor or cook, the soldier, the old man, the old woman, etc. These are just the characters that are required for the fixed plot of the fertility drama. Finally, in the exodus occurs a "sacred marriage" (together with a *comus* song and procession), derived from a sexual union which originally was consummated, or feigned, in order that all the natural powers of fertility might be stimulated to perform their function. The regular series of incidents, as outlined, forms the framework of Aristophanes's eleven plays, however diverse their themes. At first blush this statement must appear absolutely incredible to every reader, but Mr. Cornford displays the most amazing ingenuity in maintaining it.

Tragedy and comedy, he continues, have both come from a ritual drama which was "the same in type and

content, though not necessarily performed at the same time of the year". They differ in that, whereas comedy retains the whole series of canonical incidents, the Aeschylean trilogy stops with the happy ending of the hero's resurrection, the series being concluded by the satyric drama. These conventional features are what Aristotle had in mind when he declared that comedy 'already had certain definite forms when the record of its poets begins'.

All criticism implies the existence of some standard of comparison, in this case the possibility of pointing out, or of establishing for one's self, a more satisfactory hypothesis. The latter alternative I intend to avail myself of in a forthcoming book on the Greek Theater and its Drama; accordingly, there is the less need of indulging in constructive criticism here. Nevertheless, I entertain no false hopes of setting up unassailable results. The evidence at hand is too scanty for that. Mr. Cornford truly remarks (p. 220):

Many literary critics seem to think that an hypothesis about obscure and remote questions of history can be refuted by a simple demand for the production of more evidence than in fact exists. The demand is as easy to make as it is impossible to satisfy. But the true test of an hypothesis, if it cannot be shown to conflict with known truths, is the number of facts that it correlates and explains. The question left for the reader's consideration is whether, after following our argument, he understands better the form and features of this strange phenomenon, Aristophanic Comedy.

The fact is that, if the true development of Greek drama were divinely revealed to some one, he would be unable to formulate a cogent proof for it. Notwithstanding, in spite of these considerations and without deprecating the value of anthropological parallels, it is still possible to comment in all fairness upon certain features of Mr. Cornford's conclusions.

Pages 3-7 deal with some current theories of the origin of comedy. It is unfortunate that Mr. Cornford is apparently unacquainted with the two latest attempts, except his own, to treat the subject. I refer to Professor Capps's paper in *Lectures on Greek Literature* (1912), 124 ff., and Professor Navarre's paper in *Revue des Études anciennes*, 1911, 245 ff. These authorities closely agree in their results and differentiate Attic and Dorian influences most sensibly.

Page 32. For the interpretation of Aristophanes's *Ranae* 790 compare *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 40. 93 ff.

P. 36. For Aristotle's *Poetics* 1449a 37 ff. Mr. Cornford should consult Professor Capps, in the *University of Chicago Decennial Publications*, Volume 6, especially pages 266 ff. Professor Capps made it seem very clear that *πρόσωπα*, prologues, and a plurality of actors were introduced after 487 B. C., not before. Moreover, he has informed me by letter that he believes *πρόσωπα* in this passage to mean not 'masks' but 'characters'. All this has a direct bearing upon Mr. Corn-

ford's argument. Our author is troubled because, though the contents of epirrheme and antepirrheme in the parabasis are "iambic" (i. e. lampooning), the meter is not iambic. But iambic meter was invented by Archilochus, while the magical abuse of the phallic ceremonies must have started centuries before.

Pages 51 and 183. The first actor in comedy, Mr. Cornford argues, was a projection of the vaguely personified genius of the Phallic rites, Phales. But in my opinion this would place the introduction of actors at far too early a date. See the preceding note.

Pages 62 ff. Mr. Cornford makes the North Greece carnivals progenitors of comedy, as Ridgeway and others have made them the prototype of tragedy. But, since Mr. Cornford postulates practically the same source for both tragedy and comedy (compare pages 68, 190, 195, 246, etc.), the disagreement is only apparent. If the premises be granted, the original identity of tragedy and comedy logically follows. So irrational a result ought to open our eyes to the fact that arguments drawn from sympathetic magic cannot be unreservedly traced to their utmost implications. The ancient equation $\tau\rho\alpha\gamma\omega\delta\iota\alpha = \tau\rho\upsilon\gamma\omega\delta\iota\alpha$ was due to a false etymology, and its modern analogue is equally impossible. The present-day carnivals are too full of later accretions to be safely employed as evidence for the sixth century B. C. and earlier; against the possibility of tragedy springing from them still stronger objections lie (see *Classical Philology* 8. 282 ff.). Furthermore, the contention (246) that tragedy and satyric drama divided between them the ritual outlines which comedy preserved in their entirety must give us pause. What has become of the "choral agon" (the parabasis) in the division? And what convincing traces of a "sacred marriage" do Euripides's *Cyclops* and Sophocles's *Ichneutae* afford? I have too great respect for Mr. Cornford's ingenuity to assert that none can be found, but at least they are not at once discernible to the anthropologically unsophisticated.

Pages 67 f. Mr. Cornford accepts Farnell's derivation of tragedy from the worship of Dionysus of the Black Goatskin and from the duel between Xanthus and Melanthus. Compare my criticism of this theory in *Classical Philology* 8. 270.

Page 89. "The legends ultimately based on this ritual, the stories of Pelops, Pelias, Aeson, and the rest, have come down to us in forms which date from a time *when their original meaning had been forgotten*". I suppose this holds true also of the myths of Oedipus, Perseus and Andromeda, Heracles and Hesione, and Pentheus, which are the outgrowth of the same fertility ritual (58 and 66). Now, so far as fifth century dramatists treated these themes, they helped to fix the forms in which these stories "have come down to us". Consequently, according to Mr. Cornford's own admission, the "original meaning" of these had already been lost sight of at that period. Similarly,

Mr. Cornford says that tragedy borrowed from heroic legends such stories as illustrate the fundamental conception of the old ritual plot, which explains Aristotle's statement "that 'Tragedies are restricted to a small number of (heroic) families . . . in which such horrors have occurred', *but he could not know the reason*" (p. 211 and n.). The words which I have italicized in these two quotations are a necessary concession; but, as has already been pointed out in the second paragraph of this review, they relinquish the only consideration that could make Mr. Cornford's argument plausible. If so much can not be postulated for any part of his argument, that part is seriously impaired. It is partly because this *can* be postulated for the physical violence and obscenity of Old Comedy that I am willing to accept Mr. Cornford's reasoning at that point. Now, if Aristotle knew nothing of the ritual plot, neither did fourth century playwrights; and we have just seen that fifth century tragedians were equally ignorant. It follows that, if Aeschylus and Euripides when dramatizing the Pentheus myth, for example, were no more conscious of dependence upon a ritual plot than was Marlowe in writing Doctor Faustus, the influence of primitive ritual upon mature tragedy must have been nonexistent or negligible. Then the question takes another form—did the tragic poets *unconsciously* follow a fixed series of incidents? When this notion leads Mr. Cornford to allege that the agon between Admetus and Pheres in Euripides's *Alkestis* is "barely intelligible except in the light of the old ritual conflict of the Young King claiming to supersede the outworn Old King" (p. 78), I for one am not impressed.

In comedy he fares no better: compare the suggestion that in Aristophanes's *Frogs* Euripides's complaint at being 'left for dead' in the underworld "gains point if we suppose a reminiscence that such had originally been the Antagonist's fate" (82). Mr. Cornford is constantly insisting that the strength of his arguments rests in its cumulative effect. But when this arises from such details as these, one's faith grows less rather than greater. Upon comedy, however, our author evidently believes the fixed plot of primitive ritual to have exercised a conscious influence. Such an unchanging plot would naturally result in a set of stock characters. Therefore, the heroes of comedy—"especially certain very important ones, who bear historical names—are made to wear one or another of a definite set of stock masks. They are, to the almost complete sacrifice of realistic portraiture, conformed to the traditional traits of these masks" (154). Lamachus and Aeschylus (!) are adaptations of the Miles Gloriosus, Socrates and Euripides of the Learned Doctor, Agoracritus of the Cook, Cleon of the Parasite, etc. All this implies conscious adaptation on the part of the comic poet and perfect understanding by the public of what he was doing. Now is it conceivable that Cleon would have been so stung by Aristophanes's attacks and

that Socrates in the *Apology* could have attributed to the Clouds so much of the feeling against him, if every one had known that Aristophanes, like another Procrustes, was merely forcing his contemporaries to lie in the places of conventionalized, stock characters? The exigencies of this argument compel Mr. Cornford to maintain (168) that of all the historical characters in comedy "the only one represented by anything like a recognizable portrait is Cleon" (!). Of course, he has to grant that "it is just in this case that Aristophanes explicitly says that the mask worn by the actor was not a portrait of the demagogue's real features". He tries to break the force of so damning a statement by alleging that "the excuse that no costumer could be found who was willing to make anything so terrific as a portrait-mask of Cleon, is a joke and not to be taken literally". But "so terrific" here is due to a misinterpretation of Aristophanes, for *ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ* refers to fear of Cleon's vengeance. With this correction the "joke" disappears, and the whole argument collapses.

Pages 100-102. Mr. Cornford considers the scattering of sweetmeats to the spectators in Old Comedy to be a survival of the communal meal. I venture to believe that I gave a simpler explanation, and all that is required, at Iowa City last spring; compare *The Classical Journal* 10.212 f.

Page 217. *Ἀτάκτως* in Tzetzes does not, I believe, mean "without orderly arrangement", but "in an undifferentiated crowd". In note 1 more of Tzetzes's text ought to be quoted.

Despite my inability to accept the major part of Mr. Cornford's theories, including his two main theses that Attic comedy was entirely indigenous and that Old Comedy closely followed the outlines of a ritual plot, I concede that he has written a valuable and stimulating work, one that will repay careful study and will add permanently to its author's reputation. It abounds in shrewd deductions and subtle observations. I regret that the length to which this review has already attained will prevent my citing any of these. The style and presentation are so attractive as scarcely to permit one to lay the volume down before the last page is reached.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY. ROY C. FLICKINGER.

Livy. Books I, XXI, and XXII. Edited with brief Introduction and Commentary and Numerous Illustrations by Emory B. Lease. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company (1914). Pp. xl + 352.

This new edition of Professor Lease's Livy is well described in the Preface as a revised edition, for much of the material of the first edition (1905) has been recast, later returns have changed some of the statistical totals, while in other cases there are distinctly honorable omissions. The editor's justification of a new edition lies in numerous requests to him "to meet the needs of the less advanced student". The broader features of the first edition are retained, with altered proportions. Instead of the 72 pages of Introduction, 38 now suffice, and they appear in greatly improved form. In